



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

V. — *Hephaestion and the Anapaest in the Aristophanic Trimeter.*

BY PROF. C. W. E. MILLER,

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

THE use of the anapaest in the iambic trimeter has been treated so frequently in notes and special articles, and its use in the comic trimeter has been elaborated with such fulness in treatises like Rumpel's "*Der Trimeter des Aristophanes*," *Philologus*, XXVIII (1869), pp. 599-627, Bernhardi's "*De incisionibus anapaesti in trimetro comico Graecorum*," *Acta Soc. Philol. Lips.* I, pp. 245-286 (Leipzig, 1872), and Perschinka's, "*De mediae et novae quae vocatur comoediae atticae trimetro iambico*," *Diss. Phil. Vindob.* III (1891), pp. 321-373, that the writer feels constrained to state the circumstances that led to the production of this paper.

About five years ago I was reading Hephaestion's *Manual* for the specific purpose of noting such passages as might betoken a lack of understanding, or ignorance, on his part with reference to the things he was discussing, when, among other things, I came upon the following well-known passage (p. 21 W.): τῷ δὲ δακτύλῳ τῷ κατὰ τὰς περιττὰς ἐμπίπτουσι χώρας, ἥκιστα οἱ ἱαμβοποιοὶ ἐχρήσαντο ποιηταί· σπανίως δὲ καὶ οἱ τραγικοί, οἱ δὲ κωμικοὶ συνεχῶς, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἱαμβικῷ, τῷ ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρτίου ἀναπαίστῳ· ἐκότερον γὰρ ἄλογον· οὔτε γὰρ ἐν τῷ ἱαμβικῷ ἐχρῆν ἀνάπαιστον ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρτίου χώρας, ἐφ' ἧς οὐδὲ σπονδεῖος ἐγχωρεῖ, οὐ λύσις ἐστὶν ὁ ἀνάπαιστος· οὔτε ἐν τῷ τροχαϊκῷ, ἐπὶ τῆς περιττῆς τὸν δάκτυλον, ἐφ' ἧς οὐδὲ σπονδεῖος ἐγχωρεῖ, οὐ ὁμοίως λύσις ὁ δάκτυλος. "As for the dactyl in the odd places (of trochaic verse), the iambic poets almost completely refrained from its use, and the tragedians but rarely employed it, though the comedians constantly used it, as they did also the anapaest in the even places of iambic verse; for either use is irrational;¹ for neither ought the

¹ In the discussion that followed the reading of this paper, it was suggested that the word ἄλογον meant "contrary to reason, unreasonable," but I still think

anapaest to be employed in the even places of iambic verse, since also the spondee, of which the anapaest is the resolution, is excluded from these positions, nor should the dactyl be used in the odd places of trochaic verse, inasmuch as also the spondee, of which the dactyl is in like manner the resolution, is excluded from these feet."

A few moments' reflection caused me to believe that Hephaestion was mistaken in his views. It occurred to me that, contrary to Hephaestion's dictum, the even places were the very ones in which one should expect to find the anapaest, and I ventured to predict that the statistics of the Aristophanic trimeter would show a larger number of anapaests in the even feet than in the odd feet, the first foot, for obvious reasons, being excluded from consideration. Unfortunately other engagements prevented me at that time from testing the correctness of my prediction, but this year I have had occasion to take the matter up anew, with the result that my expectations have been fully realized.

My line of reasoning was as follows. The ordinary scheme of the iambic trimeter, no account being taken of resolutions, is

⏏ — | ⏏ — | ⏏ — | ⏏ — | ⏏ — | ⏏ — .

The irrational long, as is well known, is admitted only in the odd places. The scansion of the trochaic tetrameter, regardless of resolutions, is

— ⏏ | — ⏏ | — ⏏ | — ⏏ || — ⏏ | — ⏏ | — ⏏ | — Λ .

The irrational long is allowed only in the even feet. But if, as Hephaestion tells us, the trochaic trimeter catalectic was by some called an acephalous iambic trimeter,¹ there is some ancient warrant for our considering the iambic trimeter a cephalophorous, or, to use a term for which we are indebted

that the rendering given above is to be preferred, and I am pleased to note that this is also the view taken by Thomas Foster Barham in his English translation of Hephaestion, Cambridge, 1843. The word *ἀλογον* is there translated (p. 150) by *alogous*, and, in a footnote to this word, is added the explanation, "that is, not according to just reckoning, or proportion."

¹ P. 20 W.: *τρίμετρον δὲ καταληκτικόν . . . , ὃ τινες ἀκέφαλον ἰαμβικὸν καλοῦσι.*

to Hermann, an anacrustic,¹ trochaic trimeter with the scansion

⊖ | — ∪ | — ⊖ | — ∪ | — ⊖ | — ∪ | — ∧,

and, with this scansion, the irrational long, apart from the anacrusis which freely admits short, long, or double short, has the same position in both iambic and trochaic verse, being confined to the even feet, or to the end of the dipodies. Now the great frequency of the irrational spondee occasioned by this irrational long, the dipodic structure of most iambic and trochaic verse, the regular diaeresis between the cola of the trochaic tetrameter, and the predominance of the penthemimeral caesura in the iambic trimeter,—all conspired to produce a tendency to a kind of catalectic effect at the end of the dipodies. If this reasoning be correct, the dactyl, which has the very opposite of a catalectic effect, would be ill adapted for the second part of the dipody, and hence, wherever used in large numbers, as in the Aristophanic trimeter, would be found more frequently in the odd feet than in the even, or, speaking in terms of the ordinary scansion, the anapaest would occur more frequently in the even places than in the odd.

Now this is exactly what the statistics presented by Rumpel, "Der Trimeter des Aristophanes," *Philologus*, XXVIII (1869), pp. 599–627, show. For purposes of ready reference, I present them here in tabulated form both for the ordinary scansion as well as for the anacrustic scansion; but, to facilitate comparison, I have, in the case of the anacrustic scansion, given the average number of dactyls per thousand trimeters, instead of the actual number employed; and I have also inserted two columns giving the ratios of the anapaests (or dactyls of the anacrustic scansion) of the odd feet as compared with those of the even feet. I cannot vouch for the accuracy of all of Rumpel's figures, but I believe them on the whole to be correct. I have tested their accuracy by

¹ I am not unmindful of Masqueray's prononciamiento, "Je rejette absolument cette théorie. L'anacrusse est une invention moderne" (*Traité de métrique grecque*, p. 152), nor have I failed to note Weil's article in *Rev. des ét. gr.*, 1900, pp. 185 f., and Gleditsch's still more recent utterances on the subject of anacrusis (*Bph W.* 1903, col. 793).

comparing my own statistics for both the *Knights* and the *Plutus*, and by counting the number of trimeters in each play. In the *Knights* my count showed one anapaest more for the second and fifth feet each, the other figures agreeing. In the *Plutus* I counted one anapaest less for the fourth foot and two less for the fifth. But these and similar differences in the number of the trimeters do not in the least affect the results in question. The only serious error detected was in the number 1182, which Rumpel gives as the number of the trimeters in the *Ranae*. I have made several counts, but cannot find more than 854, including lyric and bracketed trimeters. By the correction of this mistake, the *Ranae* receives the ninth place, instead of the last, in the order of frequency; the averages for this play and for the whole of Aristophanes are raised, and the proportion of pure trimeters given by Rumpel and incorporated in the text-books, instead of being one for every 68 trimeters,¹ is increased to one for every 66 trimeters. No distinction has been made in the table on p. 53 between comic, lyric, and tragic trimeters, but all have been counted alike. The percentage of the tragic and lyric types is so small² as not to appreciably affect the results of our investigation. In reference to the table for the anacrusic scansion it may be noted that for every anapaest of the ordinary scansion there is always a dactyl in the preceding foot of the anacrusic scansion except when the anapaest is preceded by a resolution (⊖ ⊙ ⊙ | ⊙ ⊙ — instead of ⊖ — | ⊙ ⊙ —). But these exceptions are so rare and so doubtful (see Rumpel, *l.c.*, p. 627), that for all practical purposes they may be ignored.

A glance at the table reveals an overwhelming preponderance of the anapaest in the second and fourth feet as compared with the third and fifth feet respectively, or, in the anacrusic scansion, of the dactyl in the odd places as com-

¹ As a matter of fact Rumpel gives the ratio 1 : 168, but this is manifestly a typographical error as may readily be seen by scrutinizing the figures from which the ratio was deduced.

² For the details, see Zielinski, *Die Gliederung der altattischen Komödie*, pp. 292 f.

TABLE OF FREQUENCY OF THE ANAPAEST (ORDINARY SCANSION), OR DACTYL (ANACRUSTIC SCANSION), IN THE TRIMETER OF ARISTOPHANES.

ORDINARY SCANSION.										ANACRUSTIC SCANSION.				
	No. of Trims.	Total no. of Anap. per 1000.	ACTUAL NUMBER OF ANAPAESTS.					Ratio of 2:3 or I:II.	Ratio of 4:5 or III:IV.	No. of Double Anap. cruses per 1000.	DACTYLS PER 1000 TRIMETERS.			
			1	2	3	4	5				Total.	I.	II.	III.
Equites . . .	687	512	105	104	34	79	30	352	3.1	2.6	151	49	115	44
Nubes . . .	767	454	95	125	24	85	19	348	5.2	4.5	163	31	111	25
Plutus . . .	1002	442	132	121	29	99	61	442	4.2	1.6	132	21	99	61
Pax . . .	693	438	78	85	29	70	41	303	2.9	1.7	113	42	101	59
Aves . . .	926	434	131	131	23	71	46	402	5.7	1.5	141	25	77	50
Vespae . . .	757	427	108	107	23	64	21	323	4.7	3.0	143	30	85	28
Ecclesiast. . .	895	423	97	140	20	100	22	379	7.0	4.5	156	22	112	25
Acharn. . . .	836	415	97	98	38	80	34	347	2.6	2.4	116	45	96	41
Ranae . . .	854 ¹	398	121	109	21	69	19	339	5.2	3.6	142	25	81	22
Lysistrata . . .	704	385	86	84	16	54	31	271	5.3	1.7	122	23	77	44
Thesmoph. . .	759	360	93	79	11	76	14	273	7.2	5.4	104	15	100	18
Total . . .	8880	425	1143	1183	268	847	338	3779	4.4	2.5	133	30	95	38

¹ As explained above, Rumpel erroneously gives 1182.

pared with the even, and this preponderance obtains not only in the plays taken collectively, but also, without exception, in the plays taken individually. In this connection it must also be noted that the tables given by Perschinka, *l.c.*, pp. 360 and 372, show the same overwhelming preponderance for the poets of the Middle and of the New Comedy, and for the fragments given by Kock in Vol. III, 418-468. The figures are as follows:

NUMBER OF ANAPAESTS PER 1000 TRIMETERS.

	I.	II.	III.	IV.	V.
Middle Comedy . . .	125	94	26	41	23
New Comedy . . .	119	84	23	37	23
Kock III, 418-468 . .	124	100	25	86	63
Aristophanes	129 ¹	133	30	95	38

Now it seems certain that if the anapaest really was the resolution of the irrational spondee, as Hephaestion would have us believe, the poet, though indulging in a certain amount of license if you choose, must have striven for, or unconsciously drifted toward, the more frequent employment of the anapaest in those feet that admitted the spondee, that is to say, in the odd feet. But this was not the case, for, as has just been stated, our tables show an overwhelming preponderance in the even feet. Hence, the conclusion must be that Hephaestion was certainly mistaken, and that, whatever may have been the theory of the metricians, the anapaest of the iambic trimeter was certainly not regarded by Aristophanes and the poets of the Middle and the New Comedy as a resolution of the spondee.

The thought may now arise that there is nothing very novel about the conclusion that has just been stated. I am, of course, fully aware that I am not the first to have assailed Hephaestion's position. About a century ago, G. Hermann expressed dissent from Hephaestion's view, a view that seems to have had so strong a hold on Porson, and that caused so

¹ The figures actually given by Perschinka are 124, 128, 28, 92, and 36, which numbers are based upon Rumpel's erroneous calculation, above referred to, of the total number of trimeters in Aristophanes.

much needless discussion between him and Hermann. On p. ccxii of his *praef. ad Hec.* (ed. Dunc.), Hermann incidentally combats the view that the anapaest may be considered the resolution of the irrational spondee. He argues that an irrational long could not be resolved into two shorts any more than one short can be resolved into two shorts. At the bottom of the page he goes on to say: "Quae quum ita sint, nulla prorsus caussa est, quare imparibus locis prae paribus aliqua praerogativa concedatur. Nec sane eam dari videmus in comicorum trimetris, qui, praeterquam in ultima sede, anapaestum in locis omnibus recipiunt, quum dactylum a paribus excludant. . . . Parium atque imparium locorum hic nulla ratio haberi poterit, quia, ut patet ex iis, quae supra disputavimus, anapaestus non spondei, sed iambi locum obtinet." Hermann came very near discovering the restrictions that are operative in the use of the anapaest, when on p. ccxiv he says: "Quod si tamen numerus ipse anapaestum ab una quinque priorum sedum magis, quam a caeteris, removeri postulat, erit ea non quinta sedes, ut videtur Porsono, sed tertia. Quintae enim sedis prorsus eadem ratio est, quae est primae, secundae, quartae. Sola tertia eo a caeteris differt, quod in eam incidere solet caesura." But to show that he did not get at the root of the matter, attention need only be called to a previous remark on the same page with reference to the use of the anapaest in the second foot: "in quibus formis etsi nulla est, quae principium ordinis in secunda sede habeat, poterit tamen in hac quoque sede anapaestus eo excusari, quod primus versuum ordo, quo pleniore spiritu profertur, eo facilius paullo majorem numeri vehementiam admittat," whereas the use of the anapaest in the second foot needs no excuse, as it is the one foot in which it is most frequently employed in the Aristophanic trimeter, not even the privileged first foot exceeding it in the total number of admissions of the anapaest.

Roszbach and Westphal also rejected the doctrine that the anapaest is a resolution of the irrational spondee. *Griech. Metrik*, II², p. 448 (= *Theorie der musischen Künste*, III, p. 182), they say: "Die irrationale Arsis [of iambic and

trochaic verse] lässt keine Auflösung zu. Unrichtig ist es, wenn die Metriker dies annehmen. Sie verstehen unter dem anapaestus den in den dialogischen Iamben eingemischten kyklischen Anapaest, der aber mit dem irrationalen Iambus nichts zu thun hat und schon **deswegen** keine Auflösung desselben sein kann, weil er auch an solchen Stellen des Verses vorkommt, von welchen der Spondeus bei den Griechen durchaus fern gehalten ist," and on p. 455 (= 189³), footnote: "Hephästion hält den (kyklischen) Daktylus für eine Auflösung des (irrationalen) Spondeus, doch haben beide Füße nichts mit einander zu thun." Compare also pp. 486² f. (= 227³): "Die Komödie unterscheidet sich von der Tragödie nicht bloß durch die *uneingeschränkte Zulassung* [the italics are mine] der Anapaeste," etc., and pp. 485² f. (= 226³): "Die Komödie, sowohl die sicilische wie die attische, verstattet die Zulassung des kyklischen Anapaestes an jeder der fünf ersten Stellen *ohne Einschränkung* [the italics are mine], einerlei, ob derselbe ein Eigenname ist oder nicht."

Klotz, *Grundzüge altrömischer Metrik*, p. 306, makes the following remarks: "Ausserdem aber sind in allen Senkungen mit Ausnahme der letzten auch zwei besonders flüchtige Kürzen zulässig, und zwar in der *Comödie ohne Einschränkung* [the italics are mine], im Euripideischen Drama nur im ersten Fusse bei gewöhnlichen Wörtern (wie auch bei Aeschylus u. Sophokles)," etc.

"Nun hat man nach Hephästion's (21) Vorgange den folgeschweren Fehler begangen, den bereits Rossbach-Westphal II² S. 455 gründlich abgewiesen haben, dass man diese Kürzen als die Auflösung der irrationalen Länge ansah und darauf hin in den Texten der Tragiker die zwei Kürzen in der inneren Senkung vielfach wegconjiciren wollte, vgl. Aug. Nauck, Euripid. Studien I S. 63 u. a., sicher mit Unrecht. Denn diese beiden Kürzen unterscheiden sich durchaus von den die zweimorige Hebung sowie die anapaestische und daktylische Senkung ausfüllenden Kürzen und ebenso auch von den die äusseren Senkungen der trochäischen und iambischen Dipodien bildenden irrationalen Längen, von jenen dadurch, dass sie nicht durch Wortpause von einander

getrennt oder Endsilben eines mehrsilbigen Wortes sein und als solche vom folgenden Worte getrennt werden dürfen; von diesen aber dadurch, dass sie weder in der Tragödie noch in der Comödie bloss an die äusseren Hebungen gebunden sind. Daraus aber geht mit Evidenz hervor, dass diese Kürzen Stellvertreter nicht etwa der irrationalen Länge, sondern der regelrechten Kürze sind. . . . Damit stimmt auch der metrische Charakter und ethische Werth dieser flüchtigen Kürzen vollständig, wie diesen die Verstechnik der griechischen und römischen Comödie fest ausgeprägt hat; sie retardirten nicht, wie die irrationalen Längen, sondern belebten den rhythmischen Fluss."

Gleditsch, *Metrik der Griechen u. Römer*³, p. 139, does not mention Hephaestion, but the statement, "Als eine Abweichung von der strengen rhythmischen Messung ist es zu betrachten, wenn in einigen iambischen Massen statt des Iambus der *Anapaest* eintritt, bei dem nicht an eine Auflösung der Arsis des Iambus, sondern an eine Ausgleichung der vier Chronoi des Anapaest mit den drei des Iambus durch schnellere *ἀγωγή* zu denken ist," may perhaps be construed as a protest against Hephaestion, and perhaps there is also a fling at Klotz, who, *l.c.*, thinks that the two shorts of the anapaest are the representatives of the single short of the regular iambus. But the next sentence, "Der Anapaest tritt auch an den geraden Stellen ein, aber nur in dem Dialog der Komödie mit grösserer Freiheit, sonst mit Beschränkung auf den Anfang des Verses," etc., smacks somewhat of Hephaestion. On p. 141 is found a supplementary statement with reference to the comic trimeter: "Der Trimeter der Komödie entbehrt häufig der Caesur, giebt der Auflösung eine grosse Ausdehnung, so dass die dreisilbigen Füsse überwiegen, schliesst den Anapaest nur vom 6. Fusse aus und *lässt ihn sonst ohne Einschränkungen zu* [the italics are mine], oft mehrmals hintereinander, nur wird die Teilung desselben (υ | υ _ oder υ υ | _) gemieden; selbst der Prokeleusmatikos statt des Jambus (υ υ ∞) ist vereinzelt zugelassen."

The foregoing citations show that Hephaestion's theory of the anapaest has many times been rejected, and its rejection

has been supported by more or less cogent arguments, which it is not my purpose to discuss. But the method in which the problem has been attacked in this paper seems to be a new one, and I do not know of anybody that has treated the matter in this way. The results of such a method of treatment have, at least, not found their way into the current manuals and into current discussions of the subject. None of the authors from whom we have quoted seems to have had any inkling of the preponderance of the anapaest in the very feet in which its use had been condemned by Hephaestion. Everywhere we meet such terms as "ohne Einschränkung" and "uneingeschränkte Zulassung." Even Rumpel, to whom we are indebted for exhaustive statistics as to the frequency of the anapaest in the Aristophanic trimeter, says, *l.c.*, p. 610: "Bei weitem am häufigsten . . . tritt im aristophanischen trimeter der kyklische anapaest auf, nicht nur durch seine menge—es kommt bereits auf $2\frac{1}{2}$ trimeter ein anapaest—, sondern auch durch die *uneingeschränkte zulassung in den fünf ersten füssen* [the italics are mine] scharf von dem tragischen geschieden," though, it is true, after having given his statistics for the individual feet of each play, he gives the totals and remarks: "Der anapaest ist hiernach am häufigsten im zweiten, am seltensten im dritten fusse angewendet," without, however, adding a word of comment. Of course, the author of an article does not always tell all he knows about his subject, and Rumpel may have known more about this matter than it was convenient or possible for him to tell. But this statement sadly reminds me that there are also a number of points connected with the present subject that it was inconvenient or impossible for me to discuss within the limits of this paper. So, for example, it seems clear to me why the number of anapaests in the fifth foot as compared with the fourth is proportionately greater than that of the third as compared with the second. Then, too, the method, by which I reached my conclusion in regard to the relative frequency of the anapaests in the various feet of the trimeter, was only briefly outlined, and, if there were time, I could give by way of further illustration the results of a detailed study of the

anapaest in the *Equites*, of the spondee in all of Aristophanes, and of the tribrach (anacrustic scansion) in all of Aristophanes and a portion of tragedy. But the presentation of these matters must be reserved for a future paper or papers, and, for the present, I shall have to be content, if, in regard to the erroneousness of Hephaestion's theory, this paper has made assurance doubly sure, and if, in addition to having pointed out the limitations in the use of the anapaest and the reasons therefor, it has incidentally shown that in spite of the fact that the ancient metricians may have known little or nothing about anacrusis, they might have learned a great deal more about the structure of iambic verse by the application of modern anacrusis, and that certainly we moderns cannot afford to deprive ourselves entirely of so valuable an auxiliary to the proper understanding of what is in some respects the most important form of Greek rhythm.